many other countries rely upon and use the data compiled by the IPCC as a basis for making predictions on future climate conditions and setting policy to limit potential causes of climate change.

The emails that emerged recently from the University of East Anglia call into question the accuracy of the IPCC data. There is evidence that researchers suppressed science and data that did not conform to their preferred outcomes.

I would like to read from one of the emails that was discovered:

''I can't see either of these papers being in the next IPCC report. Kevin and I will keep them out somehow—even if we have to redefine what the peer-review literature is.''

This is scary. The availability of accurate, objective, and scientific data is essential for decision makers. Given that the data was manipulated and hidden and that opposing data was potentially suppressed, it's clear that the United States should not commit to any international agreement on climate change or implement a domestic regulatory system that could damage the economy and kill jobs.

And I'm proud to be a cosponsor of Ranking Member HALL's resolution regarding scientific protocols and peer review standards. Science is based on facts and data, but there is also an element of trust when public policy and science meet. If that trust is broken, it is irresponsible for government to legislate on half-truths, incomplete findings, and bogus claims.

This administration promised openness and transparency, and they use science as a primary means to demonstrate that practice. It's time for the administration to stand up for the principle of openness, even if it means exposing findings that don't meet their preexisting policy initiatives.

CLIMATEGATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. INGLIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. INGLIS. Madam Speaker, a number of physicians would tell you that longevity is based only on genetic make-up. But you might ask them, Doctor, if I were to diet and exercise safely, might I extend my life? Well, most physicians would say, If you can do it safely, go ahead.

That is really what I think we should be talking about when it comes to climate change. If we can do it safely as to the economy, we should act. If we can't do it safely, then we should hold up.

In the case of cap-and-trade, which has passed this floor, unfortunately, and is pending now in the other body, it can't be done that way. In other words, it will harm the economy. We are talking about a tax increase in the midst of a recession. We are talking about a Wall Street trading scheme that would make some traders blush, and it punishes American manufacturing. So for all those reasons, I wish cap-and-trade were off the table. Hopefully, it falls apart over in the other body.

Then the question is, Could we act in some way that is sort of like the longevity question? It might not extend our lives, but on the other hand, would it hurt us? And in this case, what we are looking for is something that would work that wouldn't hurt us, that wouldn't hurt our economy.

And what I have proposed is a 15-page alternative to the 1,200-page cap-and-trade, and that 15 pages describes a tax cut on payroll and a shift on to emissions, the result being that we would change the economics of the incumbent fossil fuels and begin replacing them with better fuels that can create jobs and improve the national security of the United States.

Along the way, though, I think the big debate about whether the climate change models are right, and it's very important that we get it right as to those models, but that process is going to take a long time. It's going to take a longer time with this setback here recently with the revelation that various climate data has been manipulated.

What we have here is a teachable moment for all scientists everywhere that when this kind of misconduct occurs, the result is all of science is questioned. It's not a good result because the reality is we need this science to advance, and we need it to advance in a transparent way where the evidence can be pushed on and replicated if it's accurate. If it's not accurate and can't be replicated, it's rejected. But in the rejection, we learn, and science advances.

So I join with Ranking Member HALL in asking for a full investigation of these revelations about the manipulation of data because we need to get to the bottom of it. Especially in the Science Committee, we need to use this as a teachable moment to figure out how to advance science, true science, without manipulation of data in calling to account those who have manipulated data. In the process, we will all learn a lot about the climate models, we will advance science, and we will make better public policy.

CLIMATEGATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BIGGERT. According to the American Physical Society, science is the systematic enterprise of gathering knowledge about the universe and organizing and condensing that knowledge into testable laws and theories. The success and credibility of science are anchored in the willingness of scientists who, number one, expose their ideas and results to independent testing and replication by others. This requires the open exchange of data, procedures and materials, and, two, abandon or modify previously accepted conclusions when confronted with more complete or reliable experimental or observational evidence.

Adherence to these principles provides a mechanism for self-correction that is the foundation of the credibility of science.

□ 1745

Madam Speaker, the recent emails out of the University of East Anglia on the subject of climate change call into question the scientific integrity of several of the researchers involved in developing the climate science that is being used by decisionmakers around the world. While allegations of fraud and manipulation in the scientific community are troubling in and of themselves, they are even more concerning when the data in question is being used by United Nations negotiators as the basis for a global agreement to limit greenhouse gases. Such a situation should give international and domestic negotiators pause on the eve of the U.N. Framework Convention on Climate Change in Copenhagen.

Recent events have uncovered evidence from the Climate Research Unit at the University of East Anglia, which show that researchers around the globe discussed hiding, destroying, and altering climate data that did not support their narrow global warming claims. Their emails further indicate an attempt to silence academic journalists who publish research that is at odds with their ideology, and they even refer to efforts to exclude contrary views from publication in scientific journals.

Scientific research should meet high standards of quality and should not be held hostage to the ideologies of those presenting the data. It is beyond comprehension that we would even consider implementing a carbon reduction scheme which will irrevocably alter the economy and lead to more joblessness based on these fabrications. Before we move any further, we must restore scientific integrity to the process.

Recent events really show that this has not happened. The hacked emails provide evidence that researchers suppressed science and data which did not conform to the preferred outcomes. For example, one researcher commits himself to ensuring that no nonconforming science will be mentioned in the IPCC's fourth assessment report. He writes, ''Kevin and I will keep them out somehow even if we have to redefine what peer-review literature is.''

As a senior member of the House Science and Technology Committee, I cannot stress enough how important the availability of objective scientific data is for both decisionmakers and researchers. When it comes to our economy and environment, we cannot afford to make decisions on the basis of corrupted data.